

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

T.H.E. INSURANCE COMPANY,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

LAS VEGAS CARRIAGE, LLC, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:15-cv-00512-RFB-NJK

ORDER

Pending before the Court is the parties' joint proposed discovery plan, which is deficient in numerous respects. Docket No. 40. A joint proposed discovery plan must state the date the first defendant answered or otherwise appeared and the number of days required for discovery measured from that date. LR 26-1(b)(1). Here, the parties fail to satisfy either of these requirements. Docket No. 40 at 3. If the parties request a longer discovery period than the presumptively reasonable period, the plan must state on its face, "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." LR 26-1(a).

Further, even if the parties' proposed discovery cut-off is correct, other deadlines in the discovery plan fail to comply with the requirements set forth in Local Rule 26-1(b). Pursuant to LR 26-1(b)(4), for instance, the deadline for filing dispositive motions is 30 days after the discovery cut-off. The parties, however, request that a dispositive motions deadline one day after the discovery cut-off. Docket No. 40 at 3. The parties proposed deadlines for amending pleadings and adding parties, initial expert disclosure, and rebuttal expert disclosure also fail to comply with LR 26-1(b). Docket No. 40 at 3.

1 Accordingly, the proposed discovery plan is hereby **DENIED** without prejudice. The parties
2 shall file, no later than August 5, 2016, a joint proposed discovery plan submitted in compliance with
3 LR 26-1(b).

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 DATED: August 2, 2016

6 
7 _____
8 NANCY J. KOPPE
9 United States Magistrate Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28